DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 807 UD 018 462

AUTHOR Brittingham, Barbara; And Others
TITLE Analysis of the State of Rhode Island's Compensatory Education Projects from 1969 to Present. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Rhode Island Univ., Kingston. Curriculum Research and Development Center.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 76
CONTRACT 400-76 0021
NOTE 25p.; For related documents, see ED 142 611 and UD 018 461; Page 1 of Appendix B may not reproduce well due to print quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; *Data Analysis; *Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; *Longitudinal Studies; Program Effectiveness; *Resource Allocations; School Funds
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Rhode Island

ABSTRACT

This study outlines progress to date in Rhode Island's compensatory education programs. The study's objectives are to reanalyze existing data on Rhode Island compensatory education programs in order to describe trends in funding patterns, resource allocation and the provision of services from 1969 to present, and to analyze the feasibility of conducting a longitudinal study using existing data on Rhode Island students who have been enrolled in compensatory education programs during the period between 1969-70 and 1974-75. Activities undertaken include: (1) the review of Rhode Island's Title I annual reports by Federal auditors; (2) the review of data gathering instruments by the project staff, for purposes of determining the nature and extent of comparable information; (3) examination of data to determine which variables of interest are available for analysis; (4) an examination of the programatic implications of policy changes; (5) an attempt to resolve ambiguities in data for developing longitudinal files; (6) a study of the continuity of programs at the individual school level; and (7) the analysis of student gains in reading projects as related to factors such as intensity of service and funding level. Some details and problems which need to be addressed are discussed. Uniform variable codes for reading projects and supplementary information sheets are appended to the study. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CURRICULUM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND, KINGSTON, RHODE ISLAND 02881
Phone 792-2854 792-2922 789-8965

ED156807

Analysis of the State of Rhode Island's Compensatory Education Projects from 1969 to Present

Interim Report: July, 1976

Project Number 400-76 0021
National Institute of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This report was prepared by the Curriculum Research and Development Center under a contract with the National Institute of Education and is principally the work of Drs. Barbara Brittingham, Thomas Pezzullo, John Long, Theodore Kellogg, Pat deVito and Ms. Nancy Rieser, with assistance from Dr. Audrey Edwards, Mr. Dan Anderson, and Ms. Andrea Panciera.

CG018462

John Boulmetis, M.A.; Barbara E. Brittingham, Ph.D.; Richard Diaz, M.A.; Marcia R. Flugsrud, Ph.D.; Stephen Horwitz, Ph.D.; William J. Hunter, Ph.D.; Theodore M. Kellogg, Ph.D.; John V. Long, Ph.D.; W. Lynn McKinney, Ph.D.; David Morton, Ph.D.; Cynthia D. Park, M.A.; Thomas R. Pezzullo, Ph.D.; Nancy Rieser, B.S.; Jerome A. Schaffran, Ph.D.

The purpose of this document is to outline progress to date by the Curriculum Research and Development Center at the University of Rhode Island on project number 400-76 0021, "Analysis of the State of Rhode Island's Compensatory Education Projects from 1969 to the Present." The project was funded by the National Institute of Education as part of its plan for Research Synthesis and Secondary Data Analsis which seeks to collect and synthesize "valuable information collected by states, school districts, and educational organizations . . ." This project was funded to address two major objectives, namely;

1) to re-analyze existing data on Rhode Island compensatory education programs for purposes of describing trends in funding patterns, resource allocation, and the provision of services from 1969 to the present; and

2) to analyze the feasibility of conducting a longitudinal study using existing data on Rhode Island students who have been enrolled in compensatory education programs during the time period between 1969-70 and 1974-75.

The project proposal outlined a series of sample questions which would address those objectives.

Sample Question A: What are the dollar amounts and percent of compensatory education money spent for various budget categories such as in-service, teacher salaries, aid salaries, materials, field trips, etc.? How have these spending patterns changed over the last five years?

Sample Question B: What is the percent of money spent for student in public and non-public schools over time? How does this related to enrollment patterns in all public and non-public schools during these same years?

Sample Question C: What are the trends in dollars and percent of compensatory education dollars spend in various instructional (i.e., reading, ESL) and service (i.e., clothing, attendance) categories over time?

[1]"Research Plan: Compensatory Education Study, National Institute of Education, December 16, 1974, pp. 15-16.

Sample Question D: What is the continuity of compensatory education programs offered at the building level from year to year from 1969 until the present?

Sample Question E: What proportion of the Title I eligible schools have received Title I money from 1969 to present?

Sample Question F: What are trends in concentration of programs by grade levels over time?

Sample Question G: How do student gains in reading programs relate to the number of weeks in the program?

Sample Question H: How do student gains in reading programs relate to the pupil expenditures for pupils tested on grade level?

Sample Question I: How do student gains in reading programs relate to program characteristics such as presence or absence of aides, program objectives, or special services (such as clothing) provided?

For five years prior to initiating the present study, the Curriculum Research and Development Center (CRDC) had the responsibility for collecting and analyzing achievement and descriptive project data on all compensatory education projects under the jurisdiction of the Rhode Island Department of Education, including ESEA Title I projects and state-funded compensatory education projects. These data had been analyzed and reported on a year-by-year basis. It is one of the primary purposes of the present project to integrate data for the total time period involved and to report on continuity and trends in the programs.

Two major sources of data were available on magnetic tape: 1)program project information collected each year of funding from 1970-71 to 1973-74 (including such information as level of funding, major foci of the project and grade levels served); and 2)pre-posttest scores for students in compensatory reading projects.

Activities Undertaken to Date

Project staff have been meeting on a regular basis to report progress of individual staff members, discuss difficulties with the data, and plan future direction of the project. Outlined below is an overview of the progress to date with regards to the major foci of the project, along with specific examples of problems encountered and directions the study has taken to address the problems.

1. The Title I annual reports submitted to HEW by the Rhode Island Department of Education have been reviewed several times by federal auditors and Rhode Island has been consistently cited for the relative quality of the data available and the written reports. Nevertheless, despite the quality of the infomration compared to what is available in many other states, the project staff has spent considerable time delineating the nature of limitations in the data and determining the best possible way to proceed to answer the central questions to be addressed by this study.

   For example, in cases where a large proportion of information on a particular variable is missing, it has been necessary to determine if that information (or a reasonable substitute) is available elsewhere in the file or can be easily retrieved from the additional project information available at the State Department of Education. Considerable difficulty was encountered in attempting to read information of some of the program project tapes because the format codes were not uniform from year to year and information was lacking on record format. As of this date, the following tapes have been read and re-coded in common format: 1969-70, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74. (See Appendix A for a copy of recoded variables upon which data across years is available.)

2. Project staff reviewed the original data gathering instruments for the program project information for purposes of determining the nature and

extent of comparable information for the maximum number of years among those included in the study. Since the wording of particular items and the available choices to be indicated by LEA personnel changed from year to year, it was necessary to spend considerable time arriving at a "lowest common denominator" of items and choices on which to build the longitudinal data file. A related problem involved some crucial data that was collected in two or three annual surveys in the five years covered by the study and not collected in the other two or three years.

> For example, for several years a checklist of six categories of the "most significant" cause of the child's educational deprivation was administered. However, during one year the same data were collected in a four-fold categorization, into which the original six categories do not easily collapse.
>
> For example, ethnic and racial group membership was collected each year but was redefined during one annual collection so as to prevent easy comparisons in racial and ethnic makeup from year to year.

3. A major effort of the staff to date has been to examine the existing data and determine which of the possible variables-of-interest are available for analysis. In some cases variables have been created for purposes of the study; in other instances it has been necessary to forego the most potentially useful types of information and be satisfied with what was available.

> For example, in attempting to build a file that will help describe the continuity of programs at the building level, it has been necessary to assume that attendance area boundaries have remained essentially constant during the period in question. Further, some attendance areas are served by more than one building (e.g., an elementary attendance area might be served by one building housing grades K-2 and a second building housing grades 3-6); program continuity studies are therefore being planned with the unit of analysis being the attendance area served by a building or combination of buildings.

Another area of interest has been the residential distribution and school attendance patterns of disadvantaged students. Examination of existing records has indicated that information on the number of students residing within a district not attending school in that district (e.g., attending school in another district, dropouts, or placed in institutions) is markedly incomplete for many districts. Data on the number of students actually attending public, private, parochial and institutional schools within the district, on the other hand, is relatively complete. Data on students for the study, therefore, will reflect the school in which the student is enrolled rather than the district in which the student resides.

Many districts, lacking clear directions for completing the data collection instruments, did not give unduplicated counts in reporting numbers of students served by various aspects of a program. It is also difficult to determine the total unduplicated number of students served by all Title I programs within a town. Thus, the report can focus on the number of students within a program or program aspect and the intensity of service per program but will not be able to determine, for example, the distribution of total time students spend in Title I services when more than one service is available at a particular attendance center.

4. Policy changes occuring at the LEA level have had programatic implications that will affect the degree to which the study represents the history of compensatory education in the state. Through their experience in working with local Rhode Island schools, project staff are aware of the implications of several of these changes for the existing study.

   Among the other changes that take place in definitions, data, criteria and the like, some districts actually made enormous revisions in the approach they were taking in remediation, which was not accompanied by a substantial change in the documentation.

   One large district removed its reading program from Title I funding for part of the time period covered by the current study. This shift effectively removed the programs from the state data collection system by placing all of what had previously been Title I program to Emergency Schools Assistance Act funds. Title I funds were then shifted to remedial programs other than reading.

5. Another serious problem in developing longitudinal files was the occasional ambiguity inherent in data which superficially appeared homogeneous, but upon investigation proved to represent substantially

different underlying pheonomena.

> One measure of interest in examination of trends is the number of students served in a project. However, the numbers served in two different districts might be the same while the intensity of service differed drastically. One district, serving 100 students in remedial reading, might have one reading specialist devoting an average of 15 minutes per week to in-class supplementary instruction, while another district also serving 100 students might have a full-time specialist, two aides and a part-time counselor with five groups of 20 students each receiving one hour of service per day. The project staff is currently considering methods of developing a definition of full-time equivalent students or a composite index of program intensity.

6. One focus of the present project is to study the continuity of programs at the building level during the time covered by the study. Since data currently available on magnetic tape did not report program project data at the building level it was necessary to build an expanded data file to address this area of the study.[1] A very substantial amount of effort of the project staff to date has been spent in defining the parameters of this additional data file, determining the availability of the data and actually gathering the data from original project documents (applications and amendments) on file at the State Department of Education. The new file, when integrated with existing files will help address questions such as:

   A. What has been the continuity of reading programs, for example, from one year to the next at the building level?

   B. What criteria of determining eligibility of attendance areas have LEAS used over the years covered by the study (e.g., census data, AFDC data)?

   C. What method of ranking attendance areas (by number or percentage of low-income children or some combination of the two) has an LEA used to determine building eligibility and how has this affected

---

[1]Appendix B contains samples of data collection sheets being used to gather the additional information.

continuity of programs?

7. A second major focus of the project proposal concerned the analysis of student gains in reading projects as related to selected program-related factors such as intensity of service, funding level and so forth. One difficulty in addressing this section of the current project involves the various types and levels of the tests used. From 1969-70 until 1973-74, pre and posttest scores are available on the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test. There are more than 16 forms of the test and some differences in norms when machine-scorable as opposed to hand-scored answer sheets are used. Despite this potential for wide variance, data collection and comparability of results were assured within any given year. From 1969-70 until 1970-71, all students in compensatory projects were tested "on level," that is with the level of the test appropriate for their grade placement. In 1971, however, the Rhode Island tepartment of Education, yielding to pressure from program directors and other LEA personnel, allowed students to be tested "out of level," with a test of a lower difficulty designed for application in lower grades or normed with younger students. The specific effects of out-of-level testing on program evaluation and student selection have been described in an earlier CRDC technical report (The Effects of Grade and Instructional Level Testing on Reading Achievement Data for Disadvantaged Students CRDC Technical Report, Long and Schaffran, 1974). After careful consideration of the data from this earlier study, consultation with outside psychometric and statistics experts, and contact with the test publishers, project staff have concluded that data collected from on-level testing cannot be legitimately integrated with data from out-of-level testing through the use of grade equivalent scores or by

other means. This decision implies that the major analyses of reading achievement for this study using the Gates-MacGinitie will involve students tested on-level, with supplementary analyses of students tested out-of-level as deemed appropriate by project staff.

8. Finally, one intent of the present study is to analyze the feasibility of conducting a longitudinal study using extant data sources. The feasibility analysis is being pursued in a three-stage process. First, as outlined above, the project staff are indentifying attendance areas which had reasonably stable compensatory education projects during some portion of the period in question. Second, those LEAs and schools will be contacted to determine whether the data needed to perform a longitudinal study are available in a useable form that would allow the performance of individual students to be studied over time. Third, the project staff will analyze the available data and make recommendations as to which, if any, longitudinal studies might best be undertaken.

As of the submission of this interim report, project staff are continuing to meet on a regular basis to continue to resolve issues similar to those outlined above and to plan the appropriate analysis to address the issues raised by the sample questions outlined in the original proposal.

APPENDIX A: UNIFORM VARIABLE CODES FOR COMPENSATORY EDUCATION READING PROJECTS

1. Year data collected
2. Pre code = 1
3. LEA code
4. Project Number
5. Teacher code
6. Pupil code
7. Year/Month of Birth of Student
8. Grade:

   01 - 12
   13 = Pre School
   14 = Kindergarten
   15 = Special Education

9. Sex:

   1 = Male
   2 = Female

10. Ethnic Group:

    1 = Black
    2 = Other

11. Years in Title I:

    0 = none
    1 = one
    2 = two
    3 = three
    4 = four
    5 = five
    6 = unknown

12. Type School:

    1 = Public
    2 = Parochial
    3 = Private

13. Times Retained in a Grade:

0 = never
1 = one
2 = two
3 = three
4 = four or more
5 = unknown

14. IQ Score

50 - 150

15. IQ Test:

1 = Calif. test of mental maturity
2 = Chicago non-verbal examination
3 = Henmon Nelson test of mental ability
4 = Large Thorndike
5 = Otis
6 = SRA Primary Mental Abilities
7 = SRA Tests of General Ability
8 = Stanford Binet
9 = Wechsler intell. scale/child
10 = Slosson
11 = Otis Lennon
12 = Peabody picture vocabulary
13 = Kuhlman adderson
14 = Goodenough-Harris
15 = SRA tests of educational ability
16 = SRA short test of educational ability
17 = SRA Pictorial reasoning test
18 = Ohio State University psychology test
19 = None of the above

16. Cause of Child's Educational Deprivation:

1 = Physical
2 = Psychological
3 = Academic
4 = Cultural background
5 = Organic or neurological
6 = Emotional stress/Home
7 = Poor school attendance
8 = Language barrier
9 = Lack cultural experiences
10 = Unknown

17. Basis for Selecting Participants:

1 = Inconsistency between achievement and potential
2 = Teacher/professional referral
3 = Poor performance on standardized tests
4 = Pupils grades
5 = Other
6 = Unknown
7 = Classroom behavior problems

18. Project Design:

1 = Remedial/corrective
2 = Tutorial
3 = Readiness
4 = Diagnostic
5 = Developmental
6 = Other

19. Military Status of Father:

1 = Not in military
2 = Enlisted
3 = Officer

20. Type of Neighborhood:

1 = Primarily residential
2 = Primarily commerical or industrial
3 = Both residential and commercial
4 = Primarily rural, farm or open country

21. Child's Most Immediate Need:

1 = More adequate diet
2 = Medical services
3 = Psychological/psychiatric counseling
4 = Enrichment activities

22. Appropriate Materials:

1 = Would order same
2 = Would order some different
3 = Would order none

23. Design vs. Need:

1 = Meets needs
2 = Doesn't meet needs

24. Gates Test Used:

    1 = Gates MacGinitie
    2 = Other
    3 = No test
    4 = California
    5 = Metropolitan

25. Time Test Administered:

    Year/Month

26. Form of Test:

    1 = Readiness
    2 = Primary A
    3 = " B
    4 = " C
    5 = Survey D
    6 = " Dm
    7 = " E
    8 = " Em
    9 = " F
    10 = Calif. Form 1
    11 = " " 2
    12 = " " 3
    13 = " " 4
    14 = Metro. Form 1
    15 = " " 2

27. Vocabulary Raw Score
28. Comprehension Raw Score

} Gates

29. Readiness Total Weighted Score
30. Interval in Weeks between Beginning of Instruction and Pre-Test
31. Other Scores
32. Other Scores
33. Other Scores

Post Data Variables

1. Year Data Collected
2. Post Code = 2
3. LEA Code
4. Project Number
5. Teacher Code
6. Pupil Code
7. Days Absent:

   00-99 ('70 = since 1st day of school;

   '71-'72 = Since enrollment in program)

8. Total Number of Home Visitations
9. Number of Home Visitations by Social Worker
10. " " " " " Teacher
11. " " " " " Psychologist
12. " " " " " Liaison
13. " " " " " Counselor

(8–13: 00-99)

14. Pupil Given Individualized Standardized Test
15. " " Intelligence Test
16. " " Aptitude Test
17. " " Diagnostic Test
18. " " Achievement Test
19. Has Pupil Had Detailed Psychological Assessment

(14–19: 1=yes, 2=no)

20. Hours Spent by Pupil in Title I Activity:

    1 = < 50
    2 = 51 - 100
    3 = 101 - 125
    4 = 126 - 150
    5 = 151 - 175
    6 = 176 - 200
    7 = > 200

21. Was Child Exposed to Activities to Enrich Cultural Background:

    1 = yes
    2 = no

22. Child Received Guidance and Counseling
23. " " Speech and/or Hearing Service
24. " " Mental Health Service
25. " " Nutritional Service
26. " " Sex Education
27. " " Physical Health Treatment

    1 = yes, Title I only
    2 = yes, Local only
    3 = yes, Title I and Local
    4 = yes, Funding Source Unknown
    5 = No service provided

28. Did student leave the program?

    1 = yes
    2 = no

29. Did student leave program and return at later time?

    1 = yes
    2 = no
    3 = did not leave

30. Did Child Receive Supplemental Services:

    1 = yes
    2 = no

31. Child's Reason for Leaving:

    1 = Family Moving
    2 = Parental Dissatisfaction with Program
    3 = Child's Dissatisfaction or Loss of Interest
    4 = Child's Failure to Adjust
    5 = Other
    6 = Did not Leave
    7 = Attained Reading Level Commensurate with Ability

32. Was Child Diagnosed as Handicapped?

    1 = Mentally Retarded
    2 = Hard of Hearing
    3 = Deaf
    4 = Speech Impaired
    5 = Crippled
    6 = Visually Handicapped
    7 = Seriously Emotionally Impaired
    8 = Other Health Impaired
    9 = No Handicap Diagnosed

33. Have Pupils Parents Communicated with Teacher? { 1: Yes / 2: No }

34. Gates Test Used:

1 = yes, Gates
2 = Other
3 = Not tested
4 = California
5 = Metropolitan

35. Year/Month Test Administered

36. Source of Test Information:

1 = Tests regularly given to all pupils in this grade throughout school system

2 = Tests administered in relation to compensatory education program

37. Objective of Reading Activity for Which Test Results are Recorded:

1 = Increase reading readiness
2 = Increase reading skills in general
3 = Increase reading vocabulary skills
4 = Increase reading comprehension skills
5 = Improve language arts and/or communication
6 = Other

38. Form of Test:

1 = Readiness
2 = Primary A
3 = " B
4 = " C
5 = Survey D
6 = " Dm
7 = " E
8 = " Em
9 = " F
10 = Calif. Form 1
11 = " " 2
12 = " " 3
13 = " " 4
14 = Metropolitan Form 1
15 = " " 2

39. Readiness Total Weighted Score
40. Vocabulary Raw Score } Gates
41. Comprehension Raw Score

42. Other Scores

43. Other Scores

44. Other Scores

45. Description of Reading Program

1 = 100% Reading,
2 = 75% Reading, 25% other
3 = 50% Reading, 50% other
4 = 25% Reading, 75% other

46. Weeks Spent in Activity:

1 = <6
2 = 6 - 11
3 = 12 - 17
4 = 18 - 23
5 = 24 - 29
6 = 30 - 36

APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY PROJECT INFORMATION SHEETS

DISTRICT RECORD

LEA Code: _____ (1-2)

Year: _____ (11-12)

Form No.: _____ (15)

Number of Resident School Age Children

1. Public In Applicants District _____ (20-24)
2. Non-Public In Applicants District _____ (30-34)
3. From Low Income Families _____ (48-51)

Number of Schools in District

A. Public

B. Non-Public

Banking Method: (52)

1. Percentage _____
2. Numbers _____
3. Combined _____
4. Only 1 school at level served by district
5. no attendance areas in district
6. Different methods at different levels.
7. No ranking--district ineligible this year.

Ratably Reduced Grant _____ (54-60)

Criteria and Weighting Used to Determine Low Income Families

(Yes = 1; No = 2)	Criteria	Weighting
A. US Census Bureau	Yes/No (20)	_____ (28-30)
B. Aid for Dependent Children	Yes/No (21)	_____ (31-33)
C. Free School Lunch	Yes/No (22)	_____ (34-36)
D. School Survey	Yes/No (23)	_____ (37-39)
E. Health Statistics	Yes/No (24)	_____ (40-42)
F. Housing Statistics	Yes/No (25)	_____ (43-45)
G. Employment Statistics	Yes/No (26)	_____ (46-48)
H. Other	Yes/No (27)	_____ (49-51)

Ranking: (53)

1. Elem, JH, SH _____
2. (Elem, JH) Sec _____
3. Elem, (JH, SH) _____
4. All together _____
5. Only 1 level in district
6. One school at level served/or no attendance areas.
7. No ranking--district ineligible this year.

Resident Children by Ethnic Groups

A. White	_____	(16-20)
B. Black	_____	(21-24)
C. American Indian	_____	(25-28)
D. Puerto Rican	_____	(29-32)
E. Spanish Surname	_____	(33-36)
F. Asian American	_____	(37-40)
G. Portuguese-speaking	_____	(41-44)
H. Italian-speaking	_____	(45-46)
I. India	_____	(47-48)
J. _____	_____	(49-50)
K. _____	_____	(51-52)
L. Other--Unspecified	_____	(53-54)
Low Income Families	_____	(55-58)
AFDC	_____	(59-62)
Neglected	_____	(63-65)
Foster Homes	_____	(66-68)
Total	_____	(69-73)
Low Income Children	_____	(74-77)

Building Record

LEA Code: _____ (1-2)

Building Code: _____ (8-10)

Form Number: _____ (15)

	cc. 20-24 '69-'70	25-29 '70-'71	30-34 '71-'72	35-39 '72-'73	40-44 '73-'74	45-49 '74-'75	50-54 '75-'76	(80)
1. Total Enrollment	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	1
2. Total Residing in Attendance Area	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	2
3. Total From Low Income Families	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	3
4. Eligible	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	4
5. No. enrolled who live in project area	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	5

Coding

Yes=1

No=2

Building Detail Record

LEA Code: _____ (1-2)

Type Project: _____ (3)

Project Number: _____ (4-7)

Building Code: _____ (8-10)

Year: _____ (11-12)

Form Number: _____ (15) (Circle=1, Else=2)

1. Grades Included:

Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Spec. Ed.	Drop Out
(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)

2. Total # Students: _____ (32-36)

3. Total # Students Outside Eligible Attendance Area: _____ (37-39)

4. Content Areas Covered by Project: (Check=1; Else=2)

	(cc. 40-54)		(55-68)		(69-79)
Art	_	Recreation	_	Library/Media	_
Bus. Educ.	_	Biling Educ.	_	Psychol./Diagnostic	_
Comm. Services	_	Home Econ.	_	School Social Work	_
Comm. Schools	_	Ind. Arts	_	Speech/Hearing	_
Cult. Enrich.	_	Learning Dis.	_	Student Body Act	_
Engl. Reading Read.	_	Math.	_	Transportation	_
Lang. Arts-Comm. Skill	_	Music	_	Spec. Serv-Hand.	_
Engl. Reading	_	Natural Sci.	_	_____	_
Engl. Remedial/Corr.	_	Social Sci.	_	_____	_
Engl. 2nd Lang.	_	Voc. Educ	_	_____	_
Engl. Speech	_	Attendance	_	_____	_
Engl. Other	_	Clothing	_		
Foreign Lang.	_	Food	_		
Health	_	Pupil Per/Guid./Coun.	_		
Physical Educ.	_	Health/Dental	_		